

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-30, 32-36 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration.

Applicants' representative thanks the Examiner for considering the remarks tendered by telephone on 04 Aug 2008 at 2 p.m. PST, relating to Stern not teaching automatically morphing smart buttons. It is hoped that the remarks will facilitate a more meaningful dialog during the prosecution of the pending application.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-3, 5-20, 24-30, 32-36 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-3, 5-20, 24-30, 32-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Graham et al. (6,582,475) hereinafter "Graham", in view of Stern (2003/0038840) hereinafter "Stern". Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-3, 5-20, 24-30, 32-36 under 35 USC § 103(a).

Applicants' claimed invention relates to systems and methods for conveying user information between and among users and allows user profile building to occur coincident with, for example, user browsing of electronic data sources (*e.g.*, web pages, among others). In particular, previously amended claims 1, 16, 28, 31, 32, 33 and 35 (and similarly their dependant claims 2-15, 17-20, 29-30 and 34) recite *semantic-centric input components that automatically reflect context of the current computer-based interaction*. Where a component reflects the context of the current computer-based interaction, the component can, for example, provide options for user inputs representative of some aspect of the interaction without requiring the user to manually enter information reflective of the computer-based interaction. Graham does not disclose or suggest these novel aspects of the invention as claimed. Stern does not cure this defect.

As previously stated, Graham relates to an automatic printing assistant that can select portions of documents of particular interest to the user for printing but requires the user to enter concepts and subconcepts to facilitate the selection of the portions of interest. (*See, e.g.*, Graham paragraph [0059].) Contrary to the assertions in the Office Action, the cited reference does not disclose or suggest determining user input options that reflect the current computer based

interaction. Rather, Graham allows users to manually enter terms that are used to search portions of documents to determine which portions are relevant for printing purposes. Contrary to the Examiner's position that these manual search term inputs, "reflect the context of the current computer-based interaction", applicants' representative asserts that the manual entry of search terms is not reflective at all. *In Graham, the user determines what terms to enter and search, whereby the user could enter terms completely unrelated to the current computer-based interaction and the invention of Graham would not be hindered.* The entry of concepts and subconcepts in Graham can **not** be interpreted to be a reflection of the current computer-based interaction where the entry of said concepts and subconcepts can be unrelated to the computer-based interaction. Graham states, "a step of analyzing the electronically stored document to identify locations of discussions of the **user-specified concept of interest...**", (*see* Graham at [0013], emphasis added). Graham further states, "the document need not include any special information to assist in *locating discussion of concepts of interest...*[t]hese annotations denote text **relevant to user-selected concepts**" (*id.* at [0031], emphasis added), and "step 302, user input indicating **user-specified concepts** of interest is accepted...step 304, the electronically stored document 504 is analyzed in order to identify locations of discussion of the **user-specified concepts of interest input in step 302**" (*id.* at [0038], emphasis added). The user is responsible for selecting concepts and subconcepts of interest, which can be stored in a user profile, but the user, "employs a profile editor 518 to modify the contents of the user profile file 516", (*id.* at [0043]).

In contrast, the present application describes deploying semantic-centric input components that automatically reflects context of the current computer-based interaction. For example, when visiting an electric car website, the subject invention may provide a user input button that can automatically state "I own an electric car" (reflecting the content of the webpage) that when selected can annotate the user's profile to add "owns an electric car." As the user then navigates to a webpage for a book on environmentally friendly practices, the user input button can automatically state "I have read this book" (reflecting the content of the webpage) that when selected can accordingly update the user profile.

The Examiner has turned to Stern to cure the deficiency of Graham in that Graham does not disclose semantic-centric user interface components that can automatically morph to reflect the current computing context. Generally, where a "smart button" (*e.g.*, a user interface button

the at changes how it is labeled to reflect possible opinions related to a current computer experience of a user) is described, automatically reflecting the context, as claimed, is related to providing possible related user opinions on the claimed plurality of semantic-centric input components. This is not equivalent to automatically logging user actions or areas of interest as taught in Stern.

Stern generally describes a system that can track a user's actions to develop a profile in an automated manner that reflects the user in some manner. More specifically, Stern at [0055] describes automatically detecting interests of the user and adding these to the continuously updated user profile, "The system will then *automatically extract information...and...store the information and update the **user's profile** accordingly.*" (Emphasis added.) Similarly, "The system will extract such information and update the user's intelligent profile accordingly. In this way, the user's profile will contain parameters relating to [a topic], *even though the user neither input such parameters directly* nor interacted with a Web or non-Web based data source germane to that topic." (*Id.*, emphasis added.) Stern explicitly does NOT teach (and, in fact, arguably teaches away from) populating the user interface with a plurality of "buttons" (*e.g.*, semantic-centric inputs) wherein the buttons themselves automatically reflect a current computing environment (*e.g.*, the buttons have reflective user opinion choices like "I like this book", "I have this book", "I want this book", "I don't like this book", ...) such that when these buttons are selected, they facilitate a user annotating a user profile with related perceptions about the current computer-based interaction (*e.g.*, the user can select the "I have this book" automatically morphed button and can then, for example, annotate that the version the user has is a signed first edition of the book).

Independent claims 1, 16, 28, 31, 32, 33, 35 and 36 are patentable over the cited references as the Examiner has failed to establish that each and every element of the claimed subject matter has been expressly or inherently described in Graham, Stern or any combination thereof.

Claim 1 and dependant claims:

With regard to amended claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Graham and Stern disclose "the input component comprising a plurality of semantic-centric input components that **automatically reflect** context of the current computer-based interaction..." Applicants

respectfully disagree for at least the following reasons. In Graham, the user must **manually input** a subcomponent by selecting the add subconcept button 828 (see Graham, Fig. 8) and then typing in the subconcept in the spawned dialog box (not illustrated in Graham, but see Graham paragraph [0059] “...user adds to the list by selecting a[n]...add button 828 which causes display of a dialog box...for entering the new keyword... Once the user has finished defining the new subconcept, he or she confirms...by selecting an OK button 832...”).

Graham does not expressly or inherently describe, “...semantic-centric input components that automatically reflect context of the current computer based interaction...”, as illustrated in the subject application. Graham is fundamentally different in that Graham does not reflect the context of the current computer based interaction but rather requires the user to select appropriate terms to add as subconcepts. Stern does not cure this defect and nowhere described user interface components that automatically reflect the current context and when selected would facilitate user annotations related to a user profile.

Additionally, for the same reasons, Applicants submit that claims 2, 3, and 5-15 are allowable, as these claims depend from claim 1. Therefore, based on the above remarks, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-3 and 5-15 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being anticipated by Graham in view of Stern.

Claim 16 and dependant claims:

With regard to amended claim 16, the Examiner asserts the same rejection as applied to claim 1 except that it relates to a method rather than a system. Applicants respectfully disagree for at least the same reasons as asserted in claim 1. Additionally, for the same reasons as asserted against claim 1 and claims depending therefrom, Applicants submit that claims 17-27 are allowable, as these claims depend from claim 16. Specifically, aspects of the independent and dependant claims comprise semantic-centric input components that **automatically reflect** context of the current computer-based interaction in a manner different than Graham.

Therefore, based on the above remarks, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 16-20 and 24-27 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being anticipated by Graham in view of Stern.

Claim 28 and dependant claims:

With regard to amended claim 28, the Examiner asserts the same rejection as applied to claim 1 except that it relates to a method rather than a system. Applicants respectfully disagree for at least the same reasons as asserted in claim 1 and the dependant claims thereof. Additionally, for the same reasons, Applicants submit that claims 29 and 30 are allowable, as these claims depend from claim 28.

Therefore, based on the above remarks, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 28-30 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being anticipated by Graham in view of Stern.

Claim 32, 33, and 35 and dependant claims:

With regard to amended claim 32, the Examiner asserts the same rejection as applied to claim 1 except that it relates to a computer-readable medium rather than a system. Applicants respectfully disagree for at least the same reasons as asserted in claim 1 and the dependant claims thereof.

With regard to amended claim 33, the Examiner asserts the same rejection as applied to claim 1 except that it relates to a computer-readable medium rather than a system. Applicants respectfully disagree for at least the same reasons as asserted in claim 1 and the dependant claims thereof. Additionally, for the same reasons, Applicants submit that claim 34 is allowable, as this claim depends from claim 33.

With regard to amended claim 35, the Examiner asserts the same rejection as applied to claim 1 except that it relates to a computer-readable medium rather than a system. Applicants respectfully disagree for at least the same reasons as asserted in claim 1 and the dependant claims thereof.

Therefore, based on the above remarks, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 32-35 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being anticipated by Graham in view of Stern.

V. Rejection of Claims 21-23 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 21-23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Graham, in view of Stern in further view of Wolpe (US PG Pub. No. 2002/0174144) hereinafter “Wolpe”. Applicants respectfully disagree for at least the following reason. Independent claim 16, from

which claims 21-23 depend, is believed to be allowable over Graham and Stern, either alone or in combination, as asserted *supra*. Wolpe does not correct these deficiencies. The rejection of dependant claims 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is obviated and the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 21-23 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over Graham in view of Stern in further view of Wolpe.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP477US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731